



36C

AF/3627

- 1 -

SEP 15 2003

Serial No. 09/523,079

13DV-13466

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

:

RECEIVED

Brian L. Gerhardt

: Group Art Unit: 3627

SEP 23 2003

Serial No. 09/523,079

: Examiner: G. O'Connor

GROUP 3600

Filed: March 10, 2000

: Response to Paper No. 13

For VIRTUAL WAREHOUSE PARTS
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM AND
PROCESSRESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF
NON-COMPLIANCE WITH 37 CFR 1.192(c)Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) dated August 12, 2003, appellant submits herewith, in triplicate, a complete new Appeal Brief (13 pages) that is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c).

The Notification of Non-Compliance indicated that the original brief included the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet did not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief. The original brief stated that claims 1-3 and 6 do not

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8 (a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

 deposited with the United States Postal Service
with sufficient postage as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 transmitted by facsimile to the
Patent and Trademark OfficeDate: 9/12/2003
Signature
Michelle S. Holmes

Serial No. 09/523,079

13DV-13466

stand or fall together and that claims 7-9 and 12 do not stand or fall together. Appellant submits that while arguments were provided in support of separate bases of patentability for claims 2 and 3 (the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the original brief) and for claims 8 and 9 (the first full paragraph on page 10 of the original brief), no arguments were provided in support of separate bases of patentability for claims 6 or 12. Accordingly, in the new Appeal Brief submitted herewith appellant indicates that claims 1-3 do not stand or fall together and claims 7-9 do not stand or fall together, while claims 1 and 6 do stand or fall together and claims 7 and 12 do stand or fall together. Arguments in support for separate bases of patentability of claims 2,3, 8 and 9 are provided on pages 8 and 10 of the new Appeal Brief.

The Notification of Non-Compliance indicated that the original brief did not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8). The original brief distinguished the two issues on appeal in the argument section with the designations "1)" and "2)." The new Appeal Brief submitted herewith provides more distinct headings.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the new Appeal Brief submitted herewith is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c).

Respectfully submitted,

9/12/03

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon

Reg. No. 34,500

207-791-1276